



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,437	09/01/2000	Jiuzhi Xue	57-00	5513

23713 7590 05/20/2003

GREENLEE WINNER AND SULLIVAN P C
5370 MANHATTAN CIRCLE
SUITE 201
BOULDER, CO 80303

EXAMINER

HANNAHER, CONSTANTINE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2878

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/653,437	XUE ET AL.	
Period for Reply	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Constantine Hannaher	2878	
<i>-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 April 2003</u> .			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.			
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>42-51</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 September 2000</u> is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5,6</u> .		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of Group II in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "the same search would be required for both groups." This is not found persuasive because a search for a method of "assaying" a material is indifferent to the nature of devices which might include the material.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-41 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 8.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed December 26, 2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

4. The information disclosure statement filed December 26, 2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

5. The information disclosure statement filed November 22, 2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for

Art Unit: 2878

consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

6. As set forth in MPEP § 609:

37 CFR 1.98(b) requires that each item of information in an IDS be identified properly. U.S. patents must be identified by the inventor, patent number, and issue date. U.S. patent application publications must be identified by the applicant, patent application publication number, and publication date. U.S. applications must be identified by the inventor, the eight digit application number (the two digit series code and the six digit serial number), and the filing date. If a U.S. application being listed in an IDS has been issued as a patent, the applicant should list the patent in the IDS instead of the application. Each foreign patent or published foreign patent application must be identified by the country or patent office which issued the patent or published the application, an appropriate document number, and the publication date indicated on the patent or published application. Each publication must be identified by publisher, author (if any), title, relevant pages of the publication, date and place of publication. The date of publication supplied must include at least the month and year of publication, except that the year of publication (without the month) will be accepted if the applicant points out in the information disclosure statement that the year of publication is sufficiently earlier than the effective U.S. filing date and any foreign priority date so that the particular month of publication is not in issue. The place of publication refers to the name of the journal, magazine, or other publication in which the information being submitted was published.

Note the errors in identifying the date of foreign patent documents and the author of a publication. Note that the inventor must be identified for U.S. applications. When a foreign patent document is listed, it is inadequate to supply only an abstract.

Drawings

7. The drawings are objected to because the first sheet does not include the legends Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B and may not comply with 37 CFR 1.84(i) or (u)(2). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

8. Section 608.01 of the MPEP states in part:

In order to minimize the necessity in the future for converting dimensions... to the metric system of measurements when using printed patents... all patent applicants should use the metric (S.I.) units followed by the equivalent English units when describing their inventions....

The Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademark strongly reiterated and emphasized strong encouragement for patent applicants to use the metric system in patent applications in a message appearing at 1135 O.G. 55 dated February 18, 1992. At some future time, the USPTO will consider making it a requirement.

Note the use of the micron. The Examiner is unable to require the use of SI units.

9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 25, the name of the phase has been improperly set forth.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 42 and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 42 recites a method which comprises the step of "assaying" a material. The claim does not recite any other step in the method and is thus not a combination claim. Although the claim limitation uses the phrase "step of" and not the phrase "step for", the limitation is written as a function to be performed ("assaying... for the presence of a material") and does not recite sufficient acts which would preclude application of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. To "assay" (qualitatively or quantitatively analyze a substance) corresponds to *what* the method claim element ultimately

accomplishes and does not correspond to *how* the function is accomplished. MPEP § 2181. When a step recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of step, the claim is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C., first paragraph. *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 218 USPQ 195 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The claim covers every conceivable act for achieving the stated result while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor. MPEP § 2164.08(a).

12. Claims 42 and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for assaying by making infrared dichroism measurements, does not reasonably provide enablement for any other method of assaying. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Clearly, one skilled in the art would have to experiment unduly to discern what assays are capable of determining the presence of the specifically recited material phase.

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 42-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The sole disclosed species of "assaying" provided by the specification is application of infrared dichroism measurement (page 14). Accordingly, the specification does not support any distinction between the assaying of claim 42 and the passive making of infrared dichroism measurements of claim 43. Since the scope of an independent claim and a claim dependent upon it cannot be coextensive, and since it is not apparent what might and what might not constitute an

assay under claim 42 other than the passively recited step of measuring infrared dichroism of claim 43, the claims are indefinite.

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claim 43 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

16. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: although as admitted by applicant the making of infrared dichroism measurements on liquid crystal materials is known, there is no reasonable expectation of success that such measurements would provide information regarding the presence of the specifically recited material phase.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Constantine Hannaher whose telephone number is (703) 308-4850. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with flexible hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (703) 308-4852. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

ch
May 15, 2003



Constantine Hannaher
Primary Examiner